

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig 7. This sheet, which includes Figs. 7 and 8, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 7 and 8.

Attachment: Replacement sheet
 Annotated sheet showing changes

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated February 23, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-4, and 9-13 are rejected. Claims 1-4 and 9-13 remain pending in this application with claims 5-8 and 14-16 having previously been withdrawn. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner points to the limitation “wherein the metal pattern completely overlaps the UV-hardening sealant and is formed at four edges of the first substrate” recited in claims 1 and 9. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the claims and request reconsideration.

Applicants submit that at least FIGs. 7 and 9 of the drawings and paragraphs [0053]-[0055] of the Applicants’ Specification as originally filed describe the subject matter cited by the Examiner as required by 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

In particular, FIG. 7 as originally filed illustrates an example embodiment of the Applicants’ invention that includes a sealant 310 having four sides and formed in the periphery of an LCD panel. In a cross sectional view of the LCD panel of FIG. 7, in which two sides of the sealant 310 are visible, FIG. 9 shows a metal pattern 301 completely overlapping each of the two visible sides of the sealant 310 at two edges of the LCD panel substrate.

Additionally, the last sentence of paragraph [0055] of the Applicants’ specification as filed states the following:

“When the UV ray is irradiated to the UV-hardening sealant 310 from the side of the second substrate 350 for hardening the UV-hardening sealant 310, UV ray source passes through the second substrate 350, and is transmitted through the UV-hardening sealant 310, whereby the UV-hardening sealant 310 is first hardened. Then, the UV ray is reflected to the UV-hardening sealant 310 by the metal pattern 301 of the first substrate 300, so that the UV-hardening sealant 310 is hardened a second time, thereby improving efficiency in hardening the UV-hardening sealant 310.”

Applicants submit that at least FIGs. 7 and 9 as originally filed with Applicants' specification, together with the text of paragraphs [0053]-[0055] reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the invention recited by claims 1 and 9 including “wherein the metal pattern completely overlaps the UV-hardening sealant and is formed at four edges of the first substrate.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 9, and claims 2-4, and 10-13 depending respectively from claims 1 and 9, each fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and request that rejection to the claims be withdrawn.

The Examiner objects to the Specification for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter and for reasons as noted at page 4 of the Office Action. Applicants submit that as discussed above, at least FIGs. 7 and 9 of Applicants' drawings, and the text of paragraphs [0053]-[0055] of the Applicants' specification as filed fully describe and provide antecedent bases for the claimed subject matter cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) as allegedly not showing every feature of the claims and for the reasons as noted at page 3 of the Office Action. FIG. 7 has been amended to explicitly show the relationship between the metal pattern and the sealant on the first substrate as described above. Applicants submit that the limitation cited by the Examiner is clearly shown in at least the amended FIG. 7 and FIG. 9 of Applicants' drawings. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: May 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants